

**BRIGHAM CITY CORPORATION**  
**AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES**  
**FOR *Wednesday, April 2, 2008***

Present:	Fred Baugh Gary Bywater Benjamin Jones Byron Hansen David Hess Jeff Larsen Bennie Kay Fred Kluss	Chair Board Member Board Member Vice-Chair Board Member Airmotive Mountain Air National Aircraft Owners and Pilot Association
City Staff:	Reese Jensen Paul Larsen Blake Fonnesbeck Tyler Pugsley Jolene Crockett	Councilmember Economic Development Director Public Works Director Assistant Public Works Director Administrative Secretary
Excused:		
Absent:	Dale Baron	Board Member

*Meeting was called to order at 7:00p.m.*

**Approval of Minutes – Chairman Baugh**

Motion: To approve the minutes of October 10, 2007, by Byron Hansen,  
second by Gary Bywater, David Hess, aye

Ben Jones, aye

The motion unanimously carried.

**EDA Project Area – Paul Larsen**

Director Larsen said the only significant change from what the Board has seen and discussed before is the addition to property to the north of the city's property. He said about 80 acres of Ken Fullers property which goes to the city boundary to the north, bounded by the freeway on the west and airport on the east. The project has expanded to include that property. He said the Project Area Plan is really something that implements the project area. He said process wise we have advertised a public hearing on April 17<sup>th</sup> for the RDA and at that time depending on comments they can adopt the plan. Following the RDA's adoption of the plan the city council adopts an ordinance which essentially incorporates or adopts the plan. The following week we would publish notice in the BENS that the plan has been adopted and then the Project Area Plan becomes the official guiding document and the project area is officially in existence.

Mr. Jones said when we go through the entire route and it is all approved who owns the airport. Director Larsen replied the same people who own it today will own it then. Mr. Jones stated "the city owns the airport itself." Director Larsen said yes. The City still

owns its property; private property owners still own their property. There is no change in ownership of property. He said down the road the RDA can own property, but they would have to acquire property by buying land or having it gifted. By adopting the plan it does not mean that any property changes hands. Mr. Jones said the management of the airport remains with the city not with the EDA. Director Larsen said yes. He said the RDA has no regulatory authority, zoning, or taxing ability. It is a tool for economic development.

Mr. Jones said on their own they could not let Smith's Shoe Manufacturing take land. Director Larsen said no. But, Smith's Shoe Company could come to a private property owner and say I want to buy your property and that property owner could sell it to Smith's. Mr. Jones said as they could today. Director Larsen stated "as they could today." Director Larsen said the City property that has restrictions imposed by the FAA through the grant would probably say "no that is not a use we can allow on this property" and that doesn't change on this plan.

Director Larsen said we make it clear in this plan is to incentivize businesses that either directly use the airport because they manufacture planes or something like a FedEx that uses airplanes in their business; something that has direct correlation to airport business.

Director Larsen said we have actually submitted proposals on two projects one was cut and the other one is still active; the first a manufacturer of aircraft, the second one is a service business that utilizes airports. Their criteria was to be on an airport property. What this plan does is help us to use incentives to attract business. The RDA has no eminent domain power in this project area. Simply it is an economic development tool.

Mr. Hansen said in this plan it talks about retail sales. Should you have someone related to the airplane industry, such as upholstery would be a retail project, and in his opinion would be something we would want. He continued that this doesn't preclude a non-retail business having nothing at all to do with airport business to come in. It is an objective but not exclusive. Director Larsen said a restaurant, convenience store, retail sales; in the Salt Lake Airport you have a bunch of these and some in the Ogden Airport. Those are not precluded by this, you could not stop somebody from coming in, but your ability to use tax increment for an incentive for those types of businesses may be limited. The state code says in an EDA project area you may not collect property tax increment from retail uses or from housing. It doesn't say you can't have those uses it just says you don't get any tax increment for incentives. Director Larsen said if you had an office, warehousing type use, manufacturing or assembly plant, those would qualify.

Mr. Jones said who determines where the tax increase goes? Director Larsen said the increment? It is not a tax increase. This does not increase taxes, period. He explained we would put together a project area budget. For example Nucor's project area needed a number of factors. Infrastructure and land acquisition were needed. What happens is we establish the project area, go through the process of what you need, come up with a budget and present it to the Taxing Entity Committee which in our case is made up of the City, County, School District, Mosquito Abatement, Water Conservancy District and the State School Board all have representatives and they vote whether or not to receive tax

increment. If they vote in the affirmative, by a majority vote, then the agency for whatever period of time they establish gets the increased property taxes that come about as a result of that development. For example in the Nucor case the project area budget was established when there was raw land. The value for tax purposes was set at the raw land value. Nucor came in and it is now up to approximately a \$34,000,000 plant. That plant and the increase in land value are captured for property tax purposes and the taxes that are paid on that difference in the value is what is called increment. In that project area that will come to the RDA for a period of 15 years to pay off the infrastructure costs and the land costs. The EDA plan is a similar example.

Director Larsen continued and said for example Boeing. Boeing was in the hunt for a new tanker for the air force and depending on politics they may be in the hunt again. But, while they were in the hunt he felt he could tell the Board now that they were actually looking at our airport as a potential location for a portion of that work. Had that happened he could guarantee that Boeing would be come and say "here are the particulars what kind of incentive can you provide to us" and we would look at infrastructure needs, what their investment would be in the project, how much we would reasonably expect to flow in property tax dollars, employment and we would determine along with the Taxing Entity Committee a reasonable amount that could be provided as an incentive. Having the project area in place gives us some tools that we can use if an opportunity arises that is comparable to some of those he previously mentioned. He explained it doesn't mean we will always land them but, without that tool we can just about guarantee we won't.

Chairman Baugh said as he sees this issue and the concerns of board members is the protection of the airport. He said is there really anything that would prevent something coming in on one of the pieces of private property that would have an operation that would want to go through the fence, similar to what Kemps has in Ogden, we would come up with the incentives and then it would fall flat on its face or something that would be a non-compatible use.

Director Larsen said you are probably speaking of Adam Air in Ogden. He said he didn't know if there was anyone that could 100% guarantee that these types of situations might happen. The incentive that was offered to Adam Air was a performance base incentive. They received as much incentive as they produced in order to get it. The incentives are off the table now. They may come back in the future and do that if they can get the capital they need. In the meantime what Ogden did get was a facility that Adam may come back and occupy again or they may be able to market to somebody that will come and occupy it. In terms of non-compatible uses the best protection you have is zoning or land that was purchased with grant money. Ownership conveys a whole lot more control than anything else he could think of.

Mr. Hansen said doesn't the FAA have some authority on what would be detrimental to the airport. He said we couldn't have some plant go down to this property with something that would be detrimental to the airport in the winter with smoke stacks that would create steam. He said wouldn't the FAA preclude that in the airport area. Director Fønnesbeck said he isn't sure they have a lot of control outside of the property they own. Mr. Hansen said everything inside the fenced area would be controlled. Director

Fonnesbeck said yes. Chairman Baugh said don't we have a noise profile over the property? Director Fonnesbeck said he was not sure.

Director Larsen said this plan is purely economic development with no regulatory or tax impact. The RDA cannot regulate land. By the same token there is nothing in here that encourages non-aviation businesses.

Director Fonnesbeck said anything that will develop around the airport will have to annex into the city. This will help in the zoning and certainly the city has a very important investment and understands this.

Director Larsen said he understands what Chairman Baugh is trying to say. However, this plan again is purely an economic development tool. It has no regulatory impact, no taxation impact. He said he could not guarantee that Ken Fuller is not going to have someone come along and say "I want to buy your land" and he can sell it. Director Larsen said if a company like that was to come to the city and say we bought Kim Fullers land and we want you to give us incentive for a widget manufacturer that has no benefit to the airport, we would say this is really not why we set this project area up.

Councilmember Jensen said as far as the existing council we recognize the value of the airport and have made a huge investment and we are obviously are going to protect it. The point that Director Fonnesbeck made is that a property owner can sell to whomever he wants. But as soon as they annex they are subject to zoning requirements and we control it that way. He said he could not see future councils jeopardizing the investment they have made in the property. When new businesses find they can in fly corporate jets they are elated.

Mr. Hansen asked what our role is on this document, just input and comments. Chairman Baugh said don't you want a recommendation? Director Larsen said that would be nice to have but the reason for being here is to get input and let you know about the public hearing.

Councilmember Jensen said but a recommendation would be good and carry weight. Mr. Hansen said one of the main purposes of an airport in a community is to increase the economic standing in the community and bring economic development to the county and city. This helps to facilitate that.

Recommendation: To consent to agreement with the EDA Project Area Plan for the airport by Byron Hansen, second by Gary Bywater.

David Hess, aye

Ben Jones, opposed

Recommendation carried

Mr. Jones commented that he still doesn't understand many parts of the plan, how it is written and he really doesn't believe in EDA's where major decisions can be made outside of the public light. He said nothing in here says the EDA meetings be opened to the public to know what is going on and understand. Director Larsen said to answer

some of that concern he could tell him that RDA meetings are public meetings, do receive public notice, and the city council is the RDA. Mr. Jones said they can appoint someone to manage it for them. Director Larsen said yes. Mr. Jones said that is what happened in Ogden. Mr. Jones said Ogden transferred land to a developer and the city did it officially through the EDA, but the EDA members or all the members knew what occurred and the same time they did this they had a bid that was \$50,000 more on the same land but they gave it to the other person. He said this just makes me nervous.

Chairman Baugh asked for other comments. As there were none Director Larsen was excused from the meeting.

#### **OPEN & PUBLIC MEETINGS TRAINING – FRED BAUGH, CHAIR**

Chairman Baugh stated the Open Public Meeting law says that he, as the Chairman of this Board, must educate the Board. Chairman Baugh said he thinks what they are trying to do is preclude things from happening that Mr. Jones just alluded to. It goes through a number of items, what the meanings are or what a meeting does and does not consist of. For instance if we happen to meet on the street and we talk about the airport board, that is not a meeting. It also mentions that we have to have a quorum or it cannot be a meeting. We cannot do anything in secret. It precludes a social meeting as a meeting.

Chairman Baugh pointed out something this Board has done in the past which it can no longer do. He explained if we had been going to approve some addition to the airport or make a recommendation that it be approved and we for some reason met and there wasn't a quorum we had gotten on the phone after the meeting, explained to the missing members what had gone on and gotten a vote from that. He said as he read the law he would never feel comfortable again in doing that. As far as he is concerned we will no longer do this. Either we will have a meeting or we won't have a meeting.

Chairman Baugh said there has been some question as to whether an advisory board is a public body and subject to this law. He said there is no legal question that we are a public body and subject to the law not only as a board but as individuals, as far as liability is concerned, if we go contrary to this.

Chairman Baugh asked Ms. Crockett what she perceived as taking minutes and how detailed. Ms. Crockett stated that most of the Board members could see by the minutes that they are quite detailed. She said she has had some discussion with Ms. Christensen, our City Recorder, regarding how much detail is needed. Ms. Crockett stated it seemed to her for this particular meeting it would be the preference of the Board of how detailed it should be because we have recorded minutes that could be listened to at any time. If someone wanted to hear the entire detail they could.

Chairman Baugh asked Ms. Crockett, and it's his understanding that we have to have an electronic copy of the meetings, it has to be retained and open to the public. Ms. Crockett said yes, for 1 year. Chairman Baugh said his understanding for what has to go in the meeting was it cannot just be a generalization "we met and we discussed the airport" and went home. He said there has to be enough in the minutes that a competent judge could look at it and he believed the word was "in camera" make a determination as to what really happened in the meeting and what was authorized. Ms. Crockett replied yes.

Mr. Hansen said it is pretty clear what it says there “the minutes need not be a verbatim transcript. It should be detailed enough for an appropriate judge to review them in camera to determine the facts of the proceedings.” He said Ms. Crockett’s minutes exceed that requirement.

Mr. Hansen asked if all the meetings are publically noticed in the newspaper. Ms. Crockett said she sends the agendas to the editor of the local paper and she posts the meeting on the bulletin board in the Public Works Department. She said it is up to the newspaper if they publish them. Chairman Baugh said we have to start sending the agenda’s to the state and they are going to post it to a new agenda webpage that is open to the public.

Chairman Baugh said we cannot have any kind of electronic meeting without changing the bylaws and secondly he did not think we could comply with the public notification by doing that.

Chairman Baugh said penalties are a criminal penalty for a closed meeting violation, Class B Misdemeanor subject to \$500 and 6 months in jail. He said usually it is not enforced unless it is done knowingly trying to be subversive. He said he looked at the actual law, which he had Ms. Crockett send to each of them. He read what the attorneys thought and how they had to be handled which everyone received. He looked at the DVD which was made for municipalities and if any of the Board members would like to look at it he has a copy. There are a number of items that came up with that DVD.

Chairman Baugh said the only thing he can see that could be in closed meetings is specific items. It cannot be items in general. For instance the Council cannot discuss something without knowing it applies to specific individual or a negotiation for a specific piece of property.

Chairman Baugh said regarding our items of discussion from the table. Are we required to take input from anyone other than the board members and the answer to that is no. He said in the past we have encouraged that and he would still recommend that happens. However we do have a right to exclude that if we think it is appropriate. Basically it says the board members have the rights in the board that the public does not have.

Chairman Baugh said if the Board thought there should be any changes to what we have been doing he would appreciate hearing from them.

Councilmember Jensen said one change that has been made on the Council is (not unique to the Council, but with public meetings) MaryKate Christensen has to record each members vote, yea or nay. Chairman Baugh asked if you are asking how each member votes? Councilmember Jensen said no, unless there is a dissenting vote. The council was advised by attorney that discussions outside of this meeting one on one should not occur. We were strongly advised against that. If it is an issue the whole board should hear it should be at the meeting.

Chairman Baugh said if you are going to write an email to somebody on the board or to Director Fannesbeck remember that becomes information that is publicly available.

Mr. Hansen said he read the document and he commended Chairman Baugh on his running of the board.

Director Fannesbeck said he hoped if you were going to open the meeting to the public that we have a public comment period. He said in the past we have had public discussions that have gotten out of hand. Mr. Hansen said at City Council they give them three minutes for individuals to speak. Chairman Baugh asked Ms. Crockett to please add this to the agenda in the future.

### **PHASE III CONSTRUCTION – BLAKE FANNESBECK**

Director Fannesbeck said we are making good progress. He said we basically had our final meeting with the contractors in the sense that the FAA coming out, accepting their project and now we have punch list items.

Director Fannesbeck said the airport entrance road is open. He stated we closed on that property last week. He said we are still working with the State to move their signs.

Director Fannesbeck the Electric Department is working on street lights at intersections along the airport road.

Director Fannesbeck said once we get the contractor back in they will pulverize 500 feet of the old road from the highway. Then we will put permanent barricades across the road. We will not vacate that road we will continue to own that as right of way because we have several utilities that go up and down that road. On the other end by the school district property the piece that was put up temporarily will be milled out and removed. By the bus entrance we will put up permanent barricades so no one will be able to access from the south to the old entrance road. It will be blocked off to everything but maintenance vehicles.

Director Fannesbeck said we have been having problems with the gate. He said the slightest bit of expansion with cold will cause problems. He said the gate motor size was right on the edge of moving the gate. He said we cranked it open the contractor was supposed to start work on April 1<sup>st</sup>. They are going to try and figure out where the tweaking is needed, put seal rollers as well as a 1hp motor. He said we did in the past winters if there was any snow it would also turn the gate off.

Director Fannesbeck said the north gate is working. We have some issues with the siren sensor. Some codes are working and some are not but he will review the codes. They carried the codes over and some are not working. The remote control openers he is currently trying to learn how to reprogram them.

Director Fannesbeck said we are having a nation wide problem with the supplier for the south reels. The FAA has such high requirements on these and there are few who make them. If they get slow on supplying they don't seem to care. The south reels were not

supposed to be replaced but one of the contractors last year ran over one of them. They have had problems figuring out if they ran over the primary or the slave. Now they are waiting to get them in.

Director Fonnesebeck said we only lost 5 lights over the winter which is pretty amazing with all the snow removal we handled at the airport this winter. Everything is working now. We had a couple of the junction boxes hit by the grader he has been informed that the one on taxiway A6 was lowered.

Director Fonnesebeck said on taxiway A1 when they moved the phone sign they ended up with some low spots. We have cones to warn of the drop off but they will be back to fill this in.

Director Fonnesebeck said because we are moving forward to the north we have given a 30 day notice to Ron Smith who has been leasing north of the new pilots lounge. He has until the end of April to remove the cattle.

Director Fonnesebeck said the AIP-14 project which was to purchase the wetlands mitigation will be closing pretty quickly. We spent \$37,000 on AIP 18 to mitigate and buy some wetlands where the ponds are and we brought the fence across.

Director Fonnesebeck said AIP-17/18 are still open. He said we will have to use most of our entitlement money. He said we normally get \$148,000. They will allow us \$116,000 of that this year. We won't lose the money but we won't get all of it.

Chairman Baugh said they redid the FAA law to extend it for one year. When they got to the appropriation they only appropriated ¾'s of the way. So they prorated everything back. He said they may, dependent upon what gets through the legislature, increase that to 100% but don't count on it.

Director Fonnesebeck said the \$116,000 will be used to finish what is in AIP-17 and AIP-18. He said we had some higher property values and moving expenses than were anticipated.

Mr. Jones said a couple of Sundays ago a large truck took the road by mistake. He finally found his way out on the north end. He asked where they will turn around after we close the gate. Director Fonnesebeck said there will be a gravel cul-de-sac just past the 2<sup>nd</sup> gate entrance. Mr. Jones said it might be a good idea to post a sign. Director Fonnesebeck asked if they came in on the new entrance road as there is a sign that says 'no outlet.'

Mr. Hansen asked if the parking for the tarmac is in next year's FAA Budget. Director Fonnesebeck said that is what we have programmed but it all depends on reauthorization. Mr. Hansen asked if they had a good feeling that this would happen. Director Fonnesebeck said they are still planning on it. Mr. Hansen asked if the funding was in June or September. Director Fonnesebeck said when they sign contracts is usually the next spring. Mr. Hansen said we would anticipate if everything goes it would be in the summer of 2009.



Mr. Jones asked if he was going to update the Masterplan this year. Director Fonnesebeck said we were until we found out we needed to use up all the money we had earmarked for that. They will require us to do an ALP update when we are completed with this phase but money is the issue. This will be the first thing we do. It will not be this year. When we did the project this last year it came in about \$800,000 over the budget. We cut \$400,000 out and they found another \$400,000. But they are not going to find anymore. We have to use our entitlement money to finish it up and then the ALP will come in. He said when you look at the plan it is pretty vague to the north. We would like to have a better plan that would include what we are going to do. We would like to have it planned well enough to dig and actually put in utilities, taxiways and have designated places for certain sizes of hangars. Director Fonnesebeck said he has people calling him all the time who want to put in smaller hangars. These people don't have money to put in asphalt. Right now we have places for 2 40x40 hangars and we don't have anything else. We could expand. The first year we didn't have many asking but over the last year we have had 25-30 inquiries of people who want to build hangars. The ALP plan would help with that.

#### **CURRENT LEGISLATIVE ISSUES – FRED BAUGH, CHAIR**

Chairman Baugh said a year ago the legislature was considering House Bill 401-4. They wanted to change the way the Division of Aeronautics was funded. The Division of Aeronautics comes up with about 5% of what the construction budget is for each of the airports. They also operate 2 King Airs and several smaller aircraft that they are in charge of and pay for the operation. Many years ago they set up a payment schedule for entities to use the airplanes. It was set up where they were reimbursing the Division of Aeronautics from the budgets at a given fee. Chairman Baugh said we all know what has happened in the operational costs of an aircraft. The money that has been going to the Division of Aeronautics from the State General Fund has not increased enough to take care of that so they have been subsidizing the travel of other state agencies. They haven't gotten around to making the change, as far as that reimbursement rate.

Chairman Baugh stated they came up with House Bill 365 which was similar to 414 last year and amended what happens to the taxing of aircraft. He said we have been paying \$25 as a license fee and 4% of the fair market value (low book) of your airplane as property tax. That has been administered by the county and goes into their funds. As with Box Elder County we basically pay for services from the county and have gotten little or nothing back. Chairman Baugh went on to say a good number of the airplanes that are based at the airport are living outside of our area so none of the taxes come into our area. The state changed things. If it is a license fee it goes into the general fund, if it is a registration fee and they set up the registration fee in place of property tax then it can be designated as to where it is to go. They took the \$25 fee out and called it the license and they took the 4% out as property tax, excluded it from general property tax, and called it a registration fee and with that they estimate the overall effect will increase the amount available to the Division of Aeronautics for airport construction \$501,000 in 2009 and \$527,000 in 2010.

Chairman Baugh said there use to be a fee levied in lieu of ad valorem tax on aircraft required to be registered with the state for aerial applicators. He asked Jeff Larsen if he

was aware of this change. Chairman Baugh explained that it was 2% for the value of the aircraft but is now being handled as any other aircraft and moving to 4%.

Chairman Baugh said these fees will be collected by the State Tax Commission rather than the counties and the interest that is earned from the money will not go to the general fund as in the past but will go to the Division of Aeronautics. There will be a change on what happens to the money that is paid in from the various aircrafts which are located on our airport.

Chairman Baugh explained there was an exclusion. He said the 4% use to be the wholesale value of the aircraft with \$25 for a balloon, \$5000 for each jet aircraft under 20,000 lbs and \$10,000 for anything that was over 20,000 lb. registration. They will now only be subjected to 4% of their value. This should increase tax income which comes in. Excluded from this are aircraft which are listed as home built, experimental, anything that is not listed in the blue book and they will be paying a \$100 flat fee. He said if you have an aircraft which is not registered because it is not air worthy for six months out of the year, then you are excluded from having to pay that percentage on that particular aircraft. However, if it does get registered mid year then you would pay a prorated amount during the year.

Chairman Baugh stated all of the airports if they have public use must be licensed by the State. In addition there have been problems with aircraft owners stating that their airplane was based on one airport when in actuality it was based somewhere else. The State found there were quite a number of airplanes that were reporting being based on 4 different airports. In 2009 the airport owner, in this case Brigham City, has to furnish to the State Division of Aeronautics a list of all of the aircraft that are based on the airport, showing ownership, make and model. The State Division of Aeronautics will then turn this information over to the State Tax Commission who will in turn send the bill to aircraft owners. He said he believed there will be some hassle over this. Chairman Baugh said he didn't know how many at our airport were owned by someone out of town but he believed it was ½ of the aircraft. He said it will also affect those airplanes that are listed as being in Texas, Oregon, etc. Mr. Hansen asked if the bill passed. Chairman Baugh said yes it has been passed and signed all that is left is implementation.

Chairman Baugh pointed out there was also discussion regarding onsite inspection. He said be assured that we must let them in. Chairman Baugh asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Jensen asked what our plans were on the open house. Director Fonnesebeck stated he was going to cover that under other business.

#### **Other Business:**

Director Fonnesebeck stated we need to consider what we are going to do. He said we want to have a ribbon cutting and open house. He said the Economic Development side was working on some things. He said we need to tie that together so we are not scheduling two different events. He said he did ask for some money in the budget and he

has \$2500 in the current budget and he is going to request \$2500 more. He said what he is looking to do is rolling the \$2500 with the other to have an event in July.

Director Fannesbeck said on July 12<sup>th</sup> Warren Allen is part of the Commemorative Air Force and they want to have an open cockpit day. He said they have a Sherman PT-17 and a C-45 (not sure of the rest of the numbering). He said they wanted to have it static and then provide some rides. He thought that might be a good day to tie this all together. Director Larsen has been talking about this as well and inviting business people out.

Chairman Baugh said if we want to do this on July 12<sup>th</sup> we need to get started particularly if we want any participation from Hill Field or the Utah National Guard. Director Fannesbeck said he needs someone to help with this because he just doesn't know if he can find the time.

Chairman Baugh addressed Mr. Fred Kluss and asked him if he had heard anything from Stacy regarding Airport Appreciation Day. Chairman Baugh said he spoke with Stacy in St. George and she said was going to get information up to Mr. Kluss and himself. He stated he has not seen anything and wondered if Mr. Kluss had. Chairman Baugh asked if he had the documents and video that he received as AOPA. Mr. Kluss said he had one publication on it. He said it was stated Airport Open House. Chairman Baugh said he would be happy to help Director Fannesbeck wherever he could.

Director Fannesbeck said they were looking at static displays. He said he doesn't know if there is an organization like they had in Iowa called Young Eagles. He said we helped with fuel and they provided free flights for kids. He explained 2-3 pilots would fly children that had signed up ahead of time. It was quite successful. Chairman Baugh said contact the Civil Air Patrol. Mr. Kluss said there is the Experimental Aircraft Association and they do operations like this at many other airports.

Mr. Bywater stated July 12<sup>th</sup> is quite hot. If we could move it earlier it would be better. Director Fannesbeck said he didn't think we could do that. He said if we had most of the activities in the morning and finished by 1pm we would be ok. He said we could have a flight breakfast. Mr. Hansen said you don't want to do it two months later and tie it into Peach Days. Director Fannesbeck said he didn't think we could do that and the Peach Days Committee might feel we are trying to draw attention from them. Chairman Baugh said we do need to have a representative from the Chamber involved when we plan.

Chairman Baugh asked Mr. Kluss if he would provide his email address to Ms. Crockett. Mr. Kluss replied yes.

A motion was made by Gary Bywater to adjourn, second by Ben Jones,  
David Hess, aye  
Ben Jones, aye

The motion unanimously carried.